

REMARKS:

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 103:

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamuguchi et al. (6,320,988). Applicants believe that the invention as recited by claims 1-10 is patentably distinct but nonetheless have amended claims 1, 3-4, and 6-10 to clarify the invention claimed. The limitation “an amount of parallel movement of said cluster in a plurality of frame display periods is included in the animation data” has been added to claims 1, 4, and 7-10 whereas “in said animation data” has been added to claims 3 and 6. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are patentably distinct from the cited references and request reconsideration of the claims.

On page 2 of the office action the Examiner rejected claim 1, partially on the basis of Yamuguchi’s disclosure at col. 16, lines 28-35 (16:28-35). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s interpretation of that cited passage, i.e., that an amount of parallel movement of the cluster according to animation data defines a movement of the 3D object.

Yamuguchi relates generally to a method of transforming the shape of a skeletal model using node coordinates and arc normal vectors (perpendicular to the arcs) as basic variables. Basic equations take the basic variables as unknowns and determine a solution for the basic variables of the set of basic equations (2:34-54). At the location cited by the Examiner (16:28-35), Yamaguchi teaches the use of a drag-back method in the handling of discontinuous restrictive conditions. Two calculation steps are described, first with the restrictive condition disabled, and the second step to attract the node or arc to the boundary. Although the reference describes the one of the calculation steps as subjecting the expression to the process of minimization, the reference fails to specifically teach or suggest acquiring in each frame display period an amount of parallel movement of said cluster according to animation data defining a movement of said three dimensional object or including an amount of parallel movement of said cluster in a plurality of frame display periods, as required by claim 1. That is, for example, no description is provided at the referenced location as to “animation data” or even parallel movement of the cluster. Thus, for at

least these reasons, applicant submits that the reference fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 1.

Claims 4 and 7-10 are in independent claim format and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, the dependent claims, 2-3 and 4-5, recite additional limitations, and are therefore allowable for these reasons as well. For example, claims 3 and 5 include the added limitation "in said animation data" which is not taught or suggested by Yamuguchi. On page 3 of the office action the Examiner indicated that Yamuguchi teaches the limitations of claim 3 at various locations including 7: 50-52; 28: 61-67 and 31:17-19. These locations relate generally to restrictive data as to the skeletal model and make no specific teaching as to the animation data, as required by claims 3 and 5.

In light of the above distinctions in the independent claims, further discussion of the dependent claims is deemed unnecessary. Thus claims 2-3, and 4-5 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies from an allowable independent claim and for the additional reasons discussed above with respect to claims 3 and 5.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that all pending claims 1-10 are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Russell N. Swerdlow
Reg. No. 36,943

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(510) 843-6200